

**REMARKS**

Applicants have amended independent claim 85 to depend upon claim 82.

Applicants have amended claims 23, 27-34, 72-80 and 85 to recite consistently and clearly "IMPDH" as the acronym for inosine monophosphate dehydrogenase and to remove unnecessary quotation marks. Applicants have corrected the listing of claims 41, 44 and 47 to remove markings unintentionally left in from a prior amendment filed on June 5, 2005.

None of the proposed amendments presents new matter.

Claims 23, 27-34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, 47, 63 and 72-85 are pending in this application. Applicants request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing proposed amendments and following remarks.

**The Objections**

**Claim Objection Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75**

The Examiner objects to claim 85 under C.F.R. § 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 82. The Examiner alleges that although claims 82 and 85 are worded differently, they do not appear to differ in scope. The Examiner further alleges that "[b]oth claims require docking a chemical entity

to the same IMPDH binding pocket and selecting the chemical entity by the same criteria." Applicants traverse. Claim 85 is not a duplicate of claim 82. While claim 82 recites a "method for selecting a *chemical entity*" that associates with IMPDH or a homologue thereof, claim 85 recites a method of identifying an IMPDH *inhibitor*. In the present invention, chemical entities include, but are not limited to, inhibitors (see page 27, lines 12-13 of the specification).

However, applicants have amended claim 85 to depend upon claim 82 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Support for this amendment is found in Example 6 of the specification and on page 27, lines 10-14. In light of this amendment and the above comments, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Informalities:

Claims 23, 27-34, 72-81 and 85:

The Examiner objects to claims 23, 27-34, 72-81 and 85 as being inconsistent in the use and form of the acronym, IMPDH, and suggests that the claims be amended to be consistent and avoid confusion. Examiner additionally suggests that the claims should not use quotation marks around

IMPDH and that each independent claim should specifically indicate that the acronym is for inosine monophosphate dehydrogenase.

Applicants have amended claims 23, 29, 32 and 72-80 to remove quotation marks around IMPDH, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants have also amended claims 23, 27-34 and 85 to recite "inosine monophosphate dehydrogenase (IMPDH)" in the first reference to the IMPDH acronym within each independent claim and thereafter to refer only to the acronym in these claims. As amended, claims 23, 27-34, 72-81 and 85 clearly and consistently use the acronym IMPDH for inosine monophosphate dehydrogenase, thus obviating the Examiner's objection.

Claims 41, 44 and 47:

The Examiner objects to claims 41, 44 and 47 as being listed as "previously presented" claims while containing markings from a prior amendment filed on July 5, 2005. Applicants have removed the markings from the July 5, 2005 amendment thus obviating the Examiner's objection. Applicants have listed these claims as "previously presented" because they are not herein amended. Rather, these claims are merely corrected to reflect amendments in the July 5, 2005 Response.

Application No. 09/678,016  
Amendment dated September 6, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 6, 2006

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections, enter the amendments, and pass the claims to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele A. Kercher

James F. Haley, Jr. (Reg. No. 27,794)

Attorney for Applicants

Michele A. Kercher (Reg. No. 51,869)

Agent for Applicants

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP

ROPES & GRAY LLP

Customer No. 1473

1251 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10020-1105

Tel.: (212) 596-9000

Fax: (212) 596-9090